



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,743	02/25/2004	John Douglas Methot	BEAS-1438US2	2998
23910	7590	08/22/2007		
FLIESLER MEYER LLP 650 CALIFORNIA STREET 14TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108			EXAMINER KEATON, SHERROD L	
			ART UNIT 2174	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/22/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/786,743	Applicant(s) METHOT, JOHN DOUGLAS	
	Examiner sherrod keaton	Art Unit 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 June 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5,7 and 10-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5,7 and 10-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the filing of June 11, 2007 Claims 2, 6, 8-9 have been canceled and Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 10-16 are pending and have been considered below:

Withdrawn Objections

1. The objection to claims 10-12 have been withdrawn in light of the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 4, 10-13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan (US 2003/0028364 A1) in view of Sullivan (US 20030016238 A1).

Claim 1: Chan discloses a method for extending online help, comprising:

- a.) importing an integrated development environment extension (Page 1, Paragraph 7-8), (Page 4, Paragraph 37);
- b.) processing documentation content upon import of the integrated development environment extension wherein the documentation content includes context sensitive help topics (Page 1, Paragraph 5);
but does not explicitly disclose
- c.) displaying operations for a help system wherein search capabilities and table of contents are automatically updated after the integrated development environment extension is imported. However Sullivan discloses a context based help engine and dynamic help and further discloses displaying updated help topics to user when context has changed (Page 7, Paragraph 73). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have updates of help topics when an extension is added in Chan as taught by Sullivan. One would have been motivated to update the help system because it allows user to conduct thorough queries improving user efficiency.

Claim 4: Chan and Sullivan disclose an extension as an IDE extension as in Claim 2 above and further discloses that the help system can be integrated with an extension installation mechanism (Page 2, Paragraph 15-16).

Claim 10: Chan and Sullivan disclose a help system including context-sensitive help topics as in Claim 1 above and further disclose that help topics are organized by a context ID (Page 7, Paragraph 60-61).

Claim 11: Chan and Sullivan disclose that help topics are organized by a context ID as in Claim 10 above and further disclose the context ID is a fully qualified Java class (Page 1 Paragraph 6-8).

Claim 12: Chan and Sullivan disclose that help topics are organized by a context ID as in Claim 10 above and further disclose the context ID is a fully qualified name from a non-Java resource (Page 1 Paragraph 6-8).

Claim 13: Chan and Sullivan disclose a method as in claim 1 above wherein the documentation content is in HTML or XML format (Page 3, Paragraph 25).

Claim 16: Chan and Sullivan disclose a method as in Claim 1 above wherein the IDE widgets, controls, and control properties are associated with the documentation topics that can be automatically displayed in the help system when requested by a user performing a context sensitive help gesture (Figure 2; 20). The widgets are provided when using the help system.

4. Claims 3, 5, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan (US 2003/0028364 A1) and Sullivan (US 20030016238 A1) as applied to Claim 1 above, and in further view of Cohen (US 7024658 B1).

Claim 3: Chan and Sullivan disclose a method as in Claim 1 above but do not explicitly disclose the help system including a control and a control property. However Cohen discloses an extensible help facility for a computer software application and further discloses the help system with control and control properties (Column 2, Lines 3-13). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill at the time of the invention to include control and control properties in the modified Chan as taught by Cohen. One would have been motivated to include control and control properties to allow user to generate multiple help files aimed at specific files.

Claim 5: Chan and Sullivan disclose an extension as an IDE extension as in Claim 2 above but do not explicitly disclose the help display being configured to display content in a web browser. However Cohen discloses an extensible help facility for a computer software application and further discloses the help system being configured to display content in a web browser (Column 2, Lines 3-13). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill at the time of the invention to display content in a web browser of the modified Chan as taught by Cohen. One would have been motivated to include the help display content in a web browser in order to allow user access multiple help files through hyperlinked pages.

Claim 7: Chan and Sullivan disclose an extension as an IDE extension as in Claim 2 above but do not explicitly disclose the help display is externally controllable. However Cohen discloses an extensible help facility for a computer software application and further discloses the help system being externally controllable (Column 3, Lines 5-20). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill at the time of the invention to allow the help system to be externally controllable in the modified Chan as taught by Cohen. One would have been motivated to allow the help system be externally controllable because it extends more functionality and operability of the system to the user.

5. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan (US 2003/0028364 A1) and Sullivan (US 20030016238 A1) as applied to Claim 1 above, and in further view of Chong (US 20020184610 A1).

Claims 14 and 15: Chan and Sullivan disclose a method as in Claim 1 above but do not explicitly disclose that the documentation content can support delivery of help for a particular component in a single archive file and the file being a JAR file. However Chong discloses a system and method for building multi-modal and channel applications and further discloses an extension being a single archive file and the

Art Unit: 2174

archive file being a JAR file (Page 30, Paragraph 436). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have an archive JAR file in the modified Chan as taught by Chong. One would have been motivated to have a single archive file instead of having to save a series of files with the extensions, which improves efficiency.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicants arguments filed 6-11-2007 have been considered below:

Argument Claim 1: Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of new ground(s) of rejection, as necessitated by applicant's amendment and rewriting of Claim 1.

Argument Claims 3-5, 7 and 10-16: Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of new ground(s) of rejection, as necessitated by applicant's amendment and rewriting of Claim 1.

Conclusion

7. Applicants amendments necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sherrod Keaton whose telephone number is 571) 270-1697. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. and alternating Fri. off (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, KRISTINE KINCAID can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-3800.

Art Unit: 2174

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SLK

8-10-07

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100